

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant would like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided and for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement by return of the Form PTO-1449. Applicant also notes that the Examiner has not indicated that the drawings have been approved by the Official Draftsperson on a Form PTO-948. Applicant is submitting herewith one replacement sheet of formal drawings. The Examiner is requested to indicate that Applicant's drawings are acceptable in the next Official Action.

Further the Examiner has acknowledged Applicant's Claim for Priority, but has indicated that the certified copy of the priority document has not been received. The International Bureau already should have sent certified copies of the Korean applications to the United States Designated office. If the certified copies have not been received, please contact the undersigned. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicant is submitting herewith a copy of Applicant's Claim for Priority, and our date stamped mail room receipt evidencing filing of the same. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to indicated receipt of Applicant's Claim for Priority and the certified copy of the priority document.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claim 4.

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, and 11 will have been amended and claim 9 will have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 10-14 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding

P19945.A06

objection and rejections and allowance of claims 1-8 and 10-14 in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

Applicant is submitting herewith one replacement sheet of formal drawings including corrections to the figures, in order to provide a clear view of the elements of the device and a complete understanding of the present invention. The replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to figures 9A and 9B. In particular, in figures 9A and 9B, the orientation of the spring 8 has been reversed. The amendment to the drawings is fully supported by the specification, including the claims and drawings, and no prohibited new matter has been added. In this regard, support for the amendments to figures 9A and 9B can be found at least in figure 4.

The Examiner has objected to the abstract for minor informalities. In particular, the Examiner states that the abstract is objected to due to grammatical errors in lines 1-3. In response thereto, Applicant has amended the abstract to recite --A burglar proof apparatus is provided, wherein locking and unlocking devices are provided within the storage case so that the storage case may not be opened unless the unlocking device is used, whereby burglary can be reliably prevented.-- Accordingly, in view of the above noted amendments and remarks, it is believed that the objection to the abstract has been overcome, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

The Examiner has required a substitute specification and amendments to the claims pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.125(a) due to numerous grammatical errors throughout the specification and claims. In response thereto, Applicant has amended the claims to place the

claims in better form. However, the Examiner has not pointed out any particular instances of grammatical errors in the body of the specification. Accordingly, a substitute specification will be submitted in due course after the Examiner indicates that the application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-14 for minor informalities. In particular, the Examiner states that claims 1-14 are objected to due to grammatical errors. In response thereto, Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, in view of the above noted amendments and remarks, it is believed that the objection to claims 1-14 has been overcome, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by REEVE (U.S. Patent No. 4,561,544) or IKEBE et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,385,235). The Examiner takes the position that the REEVE patent discloses a container including a holder 12, a leaf spring 28 and hanger protrusion 31, a through hole 16 in a case body 11, and dovetail engagement means 18, 19. The Examiner further takes the position that the IKEBE et al. patent discloses a storage container including a case body 2, a holder 1 with leaf spring means 9, and a hanger protrusion 4 to engage through holes in the sidewall of the case 2.

Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection of the claims on this ground, nevertheless, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8 to clearly obviate the above noted ground of rejection in order to expedite prosecution of the

P19945.A06

present application. In this regard, Applicant notes that the prior art fails to show each and every element recited in the amended claims. In particular, claim 1, as amended, sets forth a burglarproof apparatus for a data storage disk including, inter alia, “a leaf spring provided with a through hole between guide rails of the disk holder for locking the hanger protrusion in the through hole, wherein one side of the leaf spring is attached to the disk holder and the other side of the leaf spring is formed with a bent shape for separation from the inner face of the guide rail”. Claim 8, as amended, sets forth a burglarproof apparatus for a data storage disk including, inter alia, “a leaf spring provided with a through hole, one side of the leaf spring being attached to inside the rail groove; wherein the hanger protrusion of the lock groove is inserted into the through hole of the leaf spring, to thereby couple the first combination piece to the second combination piece so that said burglarproof apparatus becomes locked”.

The REEVE patent discloses a child resistant container including a leaf spring 28 that is planar and unbent, and a detent 31 extending from the leaf spring 28 for cooperating with the hole 32 in the side wall 15. Further, the leaf spring 28 of the REEVE device extends from the wall 21, positioned to one side of the pair of guide rails 18, 19 and the pair of cooperating lock grooves 24, 25. In the REEVE device, the leaf spring does not have a “bent” shape nor a through hole, nor is the leaf spring 28 positioned between guide rails in the REEVE device.

The IKEBE et al. patent discloses a casing for housing a cartridge including a planar spring 9 having a holding portion 4 extending therefrom for cooperation with the stepped

P19945.A06

portion b of the cartridge a (column 4, lines 26-43 and figures 7-9). Further, the spring 9 of the IKEBE et al. device extends from a wall of one half of the casing. As shown in figures 8 and 9, the upper and lower casings apparently are assembled by cooperation between a single surface on each side of the upper casing and a single surface on each side of the lower casing, and not by a pair of surfaces on each side of the upper and lower casings. Accordingly, the spring 9 is positioned alongside a guiding member; the spring 9 of the IKEBE et al. device is not positioned between guide members. Accordingly, in the IKEBE et al. device, the spring does not have a “bent” shape nor include a through hole, nor is the spring positioned between guide rails in the REEVE device.

Both the REEVE patent and the IKEBE et al. patent fail to disclose a device including, inter alia, “a leaf spring provided with a through hole between guide rails of the disk holder for locking the hanger protrusion in the through hole, wherein one side of the leaf spring is attached to the disk holder and the other side of the leaf spring is formed with a bent shape for separation from the inner face of the guide rail”, as set forth in amended claim 1; and a burglarproof apparatus for a data storage disk including, inter alia, “a leaf spring provided with a through hole, one side of the leaf spring being attached to inside the rail groove; wherein the hanger protrusion of the lock groove is inserted into the through hole of the leaf spring, to thereby couple the first combination piece to the second combination piece so that said burglarproof apparatus becomes locked”, as set forth in amended claim 8. Since the references fail to show each and every element of the claimed device, the rejection of

P19945.A06

claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over REEVE or IKEBE et al. is improper and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Additionally, claim 9 has been canceled. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is now moot.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by LAX (U.S. Patent No. 5,988,376). The Examiner takes the position that the LAX patent shows a key block 70 having magnets 78 to unlock locking protrusions 62 and a pin 80 for supporting the case body.

Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection of the claims on this ground, nevertheless, as noted above, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clearly obviate the above noted ground of rejection in order to expedite prosecution of the present application. Additionally, claim 6 (and claim 7, which depends from claim 6) has been amended to depend from independent claim 1. In this regard, Applicant notes that the LAX patent fails to show each and every element recited in the amended claims. In particular, the LAX patent fails to show a burglarproof apparatus for a data storage disk including, inter alia, "a leaf spring provided with a through hole between guide rails of the disk holder for locking the hanger protrusion in the through hole, wherein one side of the leaf spring is attached to the disk holder and the other side of the leaf spring is formed with a bent shape for separation from the inner face of the guide rail", as set forth in amended claim 1. Since the reference fails to show each and every element of the claimed

P19945.A06

device, the rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over LAX is improper and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2, 3, and 5 and 10, which are at least patentable due to their dependency from claims 1 and 8 for the reasons noted above, recite additional features of the invention and are also separately patentable over the prior art of record based on the additionally recited features.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and an early indication of the allowance of claims 1-8 and 10-14.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present amendment is proper and that none of the references of record, considered alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious Applicant's invention as recited in claims 1-8 and 10-14. The applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Accordingly, consideration of the present amendment, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action, and allowance of the present amendment and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.


Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so.

P19945.A06

Applicant notes that this amendment is being made to advance prosecution of the application to allowance, and should not be considered as surrendering equivalents of the territory between the claims prior to the present amendment and the amended claims.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,
Jae-Yeon AHN

 Reg No 47348
Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

October 28, 2003
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191